

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_124006
Title of the Manuscript:	RNA Sequencing: A New Frontier in Molecular Biology
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I really don't seeing the scientific importance of this review. Even it's well written, but its already known information, as well as it has no methodology involved or results.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	For this review, yes it suitable title	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract involves methodology and results, but the manuscript it's a review without such things (no methodology or results)	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	For this review, yes it is	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	As I said, my opinion. It's well written review about sequencing and its importance, no more , which is well known technology, so there are no scientific concepts being added to the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes it sufficient	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It suitable	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

#### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahmed D Jabbar
Department, University & Country	Wasit University, Iraq